Summary of Notes from the
Statewide Interoperable Communications
Stakeholders Working Session
November 20, 2008

Public Safety Communications Advisory Commission (PSCC) Voting Members Present:

- Chris Cummiskey, Director & State CIO, Government Information Technology Agency (Chairman)
- Michael Brashier, Communications Manager, City of Casa Grande
- Tracy Montgomery, Assistant Chief, Phoenix Police Department
- Leesa Berens Morrison, Director, Arizona Department of Homeland Security (AZDOHS)
- Patrick Quinn, Deputy Chief, Tucson Fire Department
- Dan Wills, Battalion Chief, Sedona Fire District
- Mike Worrell, Captain, Phoenix Fire Department

PSCC Voting Members Absent:

- Amy Brooks, Captain, Apache Junction Fire Department
- Hal Collett, Sheriff, La Paz County, Arizona Sheriff's Association
- Jan Hauk, Past President, Arizona Fire District Association Representative
- Kathleen Robinson, Assistant Chief, Tucson Police Department
- Danny Sharp, Chief, Oro Valley Police Department
- Dewayne Woodie, Fire Chief, Ganado Fire District/EMS

Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) Voting Members Present:

- Ken Leighton-Boster, Retired
- Scott Tillman, Supervising Telecom Engineer, DPS

Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) Voting Members Absent:

- Paul Wilson, Captain, Pima County Sheriff's Office
- Mark Venuti, Director, Guardian Medical Transport
    - Representative Attended: Jason Hatchett, Captain, Guardian Medical Transport
- Pete Weaver, Emergency Manager / LEPC Coordinator, Pinal County Public Works
    - Representative Attended: Jay Vargo, Pinal County, IT Radio Communications Department

PSIC DPS Advisor

- David Felix, Executive Officer, former Chairman of the PSCC and designee of DPS Director Roger Vanderpool

Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) & GITA, Public Safety Interoperable Communications (GITA-PSIC) Office Attendees:

- Lisa Meyerson, Manager, Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Office
- Regina Bernal, PSIC Support Specialist
- Ron Sober, PSIC Oversight Manager
- Michael Todd, PSIC Outreach Manager
- Justin Turner, PSIC Operations Manager
- Joyce Raschiatore, GITA Project Oversight Manager
- Brian Sherman, GITA Project Manager

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

- Dr. Jennifer Hendry, Meeting Facilitator

Overall - Members of the Public Safety Community Present

- 77 Attendees from 40 Organizations

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Cummiskey called the meeting to order at 10:04 AM. Roll call was taken by Ms. Regina Bernal. Chairman Cummiskey thanked the Commissioners, Committee members and members of the stakeholder community for their attendance. He described the purpose of the meeting as a facilitated conversation around where Arizona has been, its current state, and where the future of interoperable communications should be headed going forward. Chairman Cummiskey advised that although this was an officially noticed meeting, it was not a formal meeting of the PSCC/SIEC, but rather was designed to solicit input and dialogue around several key issues from members and stakeholders statewide. The Chairman noted that a quorum was not present for the PSCC or the SIEC. Summary notes on the 6 hour stakeholder session will be provided to the Commission, SIEC and posted on the GITA web site.

Introductory Comments

Chairman Cummiskey introduced Ms. Lisa Meyerson, Manager of the PSIC who reviewed the meeting agenda and introduced Dr. Jennifer Hendry, SAIC Meeting Facilitator. Dr. Hendry provided a brief biography outlining her experience in the first responder arena and discussed her involvement with preparing multiple Statewide Communication Interoperability Plans (SCIPs). Dr. Hendry identified the questions to be examined in the forthcoming discussion as:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of systems currently in use (relative to interoperable communications in Arizona)?

- How do we build on what is working well?

Discussion

This document summarizes six hours of discussion grouped by the following broad categories:

1. Current Status of Interoperable Communications in Arizona
2. Demonstration Project
3. The Future for Arizona
4. Next Steps

1. Current Status of Interoperable Communications in Arizona

Dr. Hendry asked participants to first consider projects related to interoperability within the State of Arizona that are already in place, and identify what about these projects is working well and what challenges and limitations have been encountered.

AIRS

Pinal County Comments: Mr. Jay Vargo stated that AIRS is working and is state-wide. There are challenges with getting agencies to program AIRS into all their radios and with getting everyone to know how and when to use AIRS. AIRS has solved a lot of issues by utilizing dispatch to communicate; people can talk one-on-one to get things done re: command and control. AIRS is a start, is in place today, and its programming into agency radios should be more widespread.

DPS Comments: Executive Officer Felix stated that AIRS was purposefully enabled to provide some form of intermediate interoperability until more robust systems could be put in place. It has allowed multiple agencies to communicate with each other. He cited a specific example of a multi-agency operation that was successful because AIRS was deployed. He stated that AIRS may be a bit limited in terms of the number of people that can be managed on the system, but is probably being used more than we know. There needs to be a better mechanism for capturing the actual use of AIRS.

Sedona Fire District Comments: Commissioner Wills indicated that as protocol and procedures are developed and training for AIRS is put in place, utilization should increase. When some additional marketing of the system is completed and some obstacles around mutual trust between centers and controlling entities are overcome, all of the elements will be in place to move AIRS forward.

Coconino County Sheriff's Office Comments: Mr. Florman indicated there is still a need to get the word out regarding AIRS. Especially when administrators change, including those at the federal level, their replacements have no idea what AIRS is about, how it affects their agency and how it affects their interoperability with other agencies.

Phoenix Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Worrell indicated that the metropolitan areas do not use AIRS very much, and that when agencies do travel outside metropolitan

Phoenix, they lack information on its usage. Until the documentation and training is available, it won't be used to its full capabilities. Another issue is that the capabilities of AIRS are pretty minimal; it's only patching together one channel, and that needs to be addressed. But it is working; it does need to be expanded and used more broadly. Commissioner Worrell suggested doing exercises focused on interoperability to support this process.

Microwave Backbone

Sedona Fire District Comments: Commissioner Wills indicated that with this infrastructure in place, Yavapai County, Central Yavapai Fire's microwave system, Sedona Fire's microwave system and DPS are interconnected and able to interoperate on a regular basis, sharing channels and resources as a seamless operation with no duplication. While the microwave is always a difficult sell, in that it is transparent behind the scenes, it really is that fundamental architecture that everything else is built upon. It is one of the elements that on a political basis need to be kept in the forefront.

DPS/Wireless Systems Bureau (DPS/WSB) Comments: Mr. Kevin Rogers agreed that the Microwave Backbone has had some successes, and the partnerships have been very beneficial, especially in the areas of AIRS and interoperability. He provided examples of where grant dollars have been used very wisely to support this system and agencies have benefited, citing the recovery of communications after the White Tanks fire as being enhanced by its use. He would expect to see many more benefits in the future as the digital infrastructure, which is still relatively new, continues to grow.

Strategic Technology Reserve (STR)

Arizona Division of Emergency Management (ADEM) Comments: Mr. Ryan Goosley indicated that they have just entered the programming and testing phase for all the equipment being implemented to augment DEMA's existing Strategic Technology Reserve.   DEMA has communication vehicles located throughout the state ready to respond. They are capable of setting up local area networks for data and voice communication and radio patching. They have ACU1000s, caches of radios that are programmable on-the-fly, generators, etc. The vehicles are not four-wheel drive so they are limited in rough terrain; however, there are two new flyaway components in addition to the trailers being acquired that can be used for rugged areas. Information regarding the vehicles, equipment and capabilities, can be found in the Communications Plan on DEMA's website.

Sedona Fire District Comments: Commissioner Wills stated that he would like to see the State operate some larger satellite downlink capacity, similar to the California OASIS system.

Phoenix Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Worrell indicated a need for better information regarding what kind of incidents the STR can support. He suggested that classifying vehicles based on federal protocols would improve the quality of information.

CASM/TICPs

<u>Sedona Fire District Comments</u>: Commissioner Wills stated there was a recognized need for an inventory of all assets at a state level. He suggested that the best format to start cataloging these is in CASM, and that the IECGP grant funding for next year could assist with population of the CASM database. He indicated that while CASM was designed as a strategic/planning tool, it is finding its way into the tactical environment, but the limitation appeared to be dollars to keep this initiative moving. He hoped that data collection for TIC plans and to populate CASM would be concurrent activities.

<u>Phoenix Police Department Comments</u>: Mr. Cooper advised that while CASM was established for the entire state of Arizona, and potentially would include other states' data, it was only minimally populated at this time. While there has been some training, one of the issues is just resource time needed to enter the data and then maintain it. There is a similar resource issue with the TICP that Phoenix has, and the IECGP funding for which Tucson has applied. He expected that while data collection for TIC plans and CASM might be concurrent, he would like to see CASM take the lead, since it offered accessibility and security components that were not inherent in TICPs.

Local/Regional Interoperability Efforts

<u>Sedona Fire District Comments</u>: Commissioner Wills indicated that regionalization has been key to a number of interoperability efforts. Many of the interactions between different political subdivisions are seamless because they take place within this regional concept. Interoperability may become even more fundamental due to funding concerns. Regional agreements are often established on a handshake and therefore may change as retirements and job changes occur. While relationships are key, an infrastructure within governance has to be built to ensure they are codified and maintainable. Prescott, Sedona, and the Phoenix Regional Wireless Network are examples of operational regional systems.

<u>Northern Arizona University (NAU) / City of Flagstaff Comments</u>: Mr. John Wilder cited an example of a good relationship that was codified and is working well, in the form of a formal IGA between NAU and Police & Fire in Flagstaff that has been in place for five years.

<u>Tucson Fire Department Comments</u>: Commissioner Quinn stated that the IGAs that are the most successful are those that recognize the needs of the citizens and what we're trying to provide, rather than the personalities involved.

<u>Phoenix Fire Department Comments</u>: Commissioner Worrell cited the Phoenix Fire Regional Dispatch Center with 26 fire departments cooperating together on a shared dispatch system. While originally based on a handshake, more fire departments saw the benefit of it and then joined. The agreement is formalized and documented, and is now part of the fire department culture. Commissioner Worrell later talked about what Phoenix Fire was doing as part of the statewide response for an urban area security initiative, to build in the capability that will allow

them to respond statewide with effective ground communications, utilizing something like AIRS as necessary for coordination with the local jurisdiction.

Phoenix Police Department Comments: Mr. Cooper stated that the Phoenix Regional Wireless Network (PRWN) had started locally, with a partnership between Mesa and Phoenix, and has really expanded much more regionally at this point. PRWN support for the Super Bowl and the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center (ACTIC) were cited as examples of what has been successful, including the sharing of interoperability talk groups, and the agreements and relationships that were built and have remained in place. Also working well, given the economy, has been the funding that PRWN has been allocated. It has been able to evolve into a regional concept, and is now starting to realize economies of scale. Mr. Cooper responded to questions regarding the 16 interoperable talk groups, addressing the benefits and limitations of using those, including the need for additional training and exercise, and why they were not kept on all the time. He indicated that Phoenix is looking to use additional grant funding to add capacity to support interoperability users longer term. He also addressed a question regarding a Department of Justice (DOJ) funded project, that helped establish a backup system for the public switched telephone network to be able to use the PRWN radio system to communicate from agency to agency, through patching stations if necessary.

Maricopa County Sheriff's Office Comments: Mr. Steve Gibson supported Mr. Cooper's statements regarding the talk groups, indicating they have been very useful so far, and in the next four months, they expect to upgrade all of their radios to XTS5000s in order to use the system.

DPS Comments: Executive Officer Felix asked Mr. Cooper to talk about the project funded by the Department of Justice, which requires an agency like DPS to contact Phoenix in order to enable the interoperability channel for them to make use of in some fashion. He did cite as a downside that it takes a little time to get the interoperable talk groups up, and therefore was not something that can be done easily for i.e. a pursuit or surveillance in progress.

ADEM Comments: Mr. Goosley talked about DEMA's partnership with APS, and how the avenue of public-private partnership can also work well.

Overall Status of Operational Components

Sedona Fire District Comments: Commissioner Wills indicated the biggest gaps are operational training, procedures and usage; these are the key areas keeping us from using the technology in place today. The ability and capacity "to do" something such as console patching has existed for years. There is need to focus on the operational components, asking the practitioner how we can best deliver that technology, and what training is needed to ensure that the technology can be properly utilized when it is needed. There is a gap, in that we don't have any firm way of training people; it would be a big undertaking but is something that the SIEC has tried to deal with. If it's not mandated, as Incident Command System (ICS) training is for grant funding, it

doesn't happen. Commissioner Wills later reiterated that it's fundamental to our success that the public safety community becomes comfortable and compliant with ICS.

Phoenix Police Department Comments: Commissioner Montgomery stated that public safety, not technology, drives their projects. IT-driven radio systems will provide the technology, but procedures and processes must be in place to utilize the technology. Plain English needs to be the standard for interoperability. Commissioner Montgomery emphasized the importance of relationships between agencies, and cited the Super Bowl as an example of that. She indicated that while governance can be difficult, relationships that are in place can get you through those difficult conversations.

Central Region Comments: Mr. Marcus Aurelius stated there needs to be a willingness of the individual disciplines to work together, recognizing that a stronger outcome will result from that. The issue is not just about being able to talk back and forth it is accepting the concept of sharing and sitting down in a room like this and communicating.

DPS Comments: Executive Officer Felix discussed how the regions have utilized their own funding streams, to try to develop communication plans for their own region, and then train in that region to ensure everyone understands what to do when an event occurs. At one point, Phoenix Fire had talked about having a cadre of trainers - people that would go out and help regions establish a communication plan, including an inventory of the assets, how to establish interoperability for large-scale events, etc. With the possible exception of the Phoenix area, there has not been a place where someone is responsible for taking that on. From a long-term planning/solution perspective, if we don't have that base-level knowledge of what's already in place, we won't make the best use of the funding that is available to move the State plan forward.

Phoenix Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Worrell stated that it was key that the operations part of communication be addressed. Arizona does not have a full-time coordinating body as California does for major disasters that can help write those procedures and ensure those are folded into the actual operations procedures for the firefighters and law enforcement officers on the ground. Commissioner Worrell later added that he supported the mandate for an oversight body at the State level to ensure that procedures are in place and communications are coordinated at an incident site.

Tucson Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Quinn stated that training for statewide programs like AIRS comes down to finances – no matter how good the program is, you need to look at what is best for you, especially if you don't have to rely on a statewide system, as DPS does. While we communicate the same way now because of NIMS, there are still different operational approaches to things. Until there is a similar mandate from an overarching agency, individual entities need to do things a certain way or there will be no funding or support and

there's going to be hesitancy. Commissioner Quinn later agreed that mandate needs to complement what is in place and working, not break it.

Pinal County Comments: Mr. Vargo agreed that while funding is needed to implement them, it takes leadership and initiative to get these plans put together. While the statewide SCIP is a great start, he would like to see a more formal commitment to governance at the county level that complements the statewide plan.

Overall Status of Technology Components

Pinal County Comments: Mr. Vargo indicated that the regions look toward the metropolitan areas and their systems to help define what can complement their efforts in the region, and help them move forward. While there is a lot of money and technology, there are questions regarding how it should be implemented and used, to move this forward, not just on the voice side, but data, video and all the other technologies that are coming as well.

DPS Comments: Executive Officer Felix stated that the microwave system upgrade to digital is critical for the State, and that we have to stay committed to that. Any large funding needs to be focused on that before moving to the next phase, which is where the State/DPS needs to go in terms of its radio system. That is currently UHF, and while there was thinking DPS would need to go to 7/800 MHz at some point, it can't get there unless the digital Microwave happens first.

Sedona Fire District Comments: Commissioner Wills stated that there was never agreement that 7/800 MHz would be the architecture for the statewide plan, even though that permeated a lot of the planning and design. The plan called for a statewide P25 trunk system with high-level connections to the existing VHF architecture – even as a statewide 700MHz overlay was being discussed the original agreement still called for a dual-band environment. Given that 11 of the 15 counties and the federal government will remain VHF, 7/800 MHz was not realistic for anything outside of the metro areas. Commissioner Wills later added in response to Commissioner Worrell's comments, that while the charter of the Commission was specific to interoperability, not operability, we need both – while there are many tools for interoperability, we need robust operability before we can move forward. When operability decisions are made with common planning and input from partners, those investments are absolutely consistent with the goal of being interoperable.

DPS/WSB Comments: SIEC Member Scott Tillman stated that the move toward 7/800MHz was driven by a lack of spectrum for statewide coverage to expand and grow in other bands. While UHF had advantages, there wasn't enough spectrum to build a statewide trunked system with bandwidth to handle not only the State's needs, but other interested parties. And while VHF might have enough spectrum, which would be almost impractical given its current state, there is little grant funding to re-study that spectrum, to see if it can be optimized and better utilized in the State. Without access to a federal or some other spectrum with white space, the only readily accessible spectrum with enough to build up and grow into, without impacting daily

operations, was the 7/800MHz band. Mr. Tillman indicated there was data in various interoperability studies that had been produced to support that position, and made reference to either the Macro or Federal report. Mr. Tillman also talked about some of the other options that DPS Engineering had considered to solve this problem. Mr. Kevin Rogers pointed out there were different opinions and approaches, depending upon whether operability for State agencies or interoperability was being discussed, which is where high-level connectivity comes into play. He pointed out that while there are advantages to the 7/800MHz band, both cost and coverage are issues.

Phoenix Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Worrell stated that the original intent was to provide a 700MHz overlay system that would address the needs of the statewide users. He indicated that this was not just an issue for DPS, but for all other State agencies as well as their connections to other systems. For the State to try and cover the urban areas, with the amount of signal intensity required to penetrate buildings, would not be cost-effective for Phoenix Fire. Commissioner Worrell later pointed out that while the Commission had been asked to consider the design for a statewide system, the State needs to have their operable system first, which interoperability can tag onto and other systems can tie into. He suggested that additional State agency representation and participation might help identify the State's needs. Commissioner Worrell later added that a statewide system would help maintain positive communication between units out in the field and dispatch centers, without the patching that is required today.

Phoenix Police Department Comments: Commissioner Montgomery cited the Phoenix system as an example of a radio system that works well, but would be better if governance had been addressed first. A statewide governance model would help address many of these questions and enable everyone to move forward with their planning.

Arizona Public Service Comments: Mr. Cliff Bailey provided his perspective regarding DPS/WSB's comments around the 700MHz spectrum, in light of the FCC mandate to narrowband by 2013. He pointed out some of the technical issues that would need to be addressed further down the road, in going with the 700MHz band.

Coconino County Sheriff's Office Comments: Mr. Tom Florman closed out this discussion with comments regarding the need for the rural counties to be represented at the PSCC meetings. He indicated there needed to be some education and outreach to get stakeholders in those areas to the table, to help decide where, as a State, we need to go.

2. Demonstration Project

PSCC Chairman Chris Cummiskey introduced discussion of the Demonstration Project by providing some history relating to the project, indicating it was important to have a conversation regarding the original plans, outcomes, lessons learned and next steps for the project, and that he was hoping for a candid, unbridled conversation on this topic.

Participants were asked to review the reference materials that were provided *(Handout: <u>DPS Project Overview and Recommendation for Further Action</u> Memorandum from DPS to GITA regarding Demonstration Project dated September 2, 2008; Presentation by Mr. Bill Phillips, City of Phoenix)*, and DPS Executive Officer Felix was asked to begin the discussion.

<u>DPS Input</u>: Executive Officer Felix explained that one aspect of the Demonstration Project was to test a technology/particular type of interconnectivity between two systems, to show that a user could travel/roam from Phoenix into Yuma and be able to maintain interoperability with a dispatcher or with their home system, in a manner similar to the concept for a statewide system.

If that test worked, the plan was then to deploy radios programmed onto those systems, and demonstrate interoperability via a field exercise. With the transition of PSCC to GITA and the budgetary situation in the State, DPS felt that moving forward with further deployment of the Demonstration Project was ill advised at this time. They feel that the project needs to be re-evaluated in light of what had been accomplished to date, what concepts had been tested and proven, and then to determine next steps.

Executive Officer Felix indicated that the best approach to enhancing interoperability with the funding that was available would need to be addressed going forward.   He hoped that everyone would gain a common understanding regarding this project out of the discussion today.

<u>City of Phoenix Input</u>: After noting that a representative from Yuma was not able to attend, Chairman Cummiskey asked Commissioner Tracy Montgomery from City of Phoenix PD to also speak on this subject. Commissioner Montgomery recognized Executive Officer Felix's comments regarding the budget situation, and noted that everyone is short on funds, resources and manpower at this time. She indicated that Phoenix made a significant commitment to supporting the Demonstration Project, and while informal, there were expectations in regard to infrastructure and radios, and the other aspects of technical support that would imply.

As Phoenix builds out their regional partner group, it was felt the situation would quickly reach a point where they would be unable to support all these activities at once, and really wanted a determination from this group as to next steps from a planning perspective.

In speaking with Yuma, Commissioner Montgomery indicated Mr. Greg Wilkinson was also not in a position to provide technical support to a future programming project.

But given that it has value, the next question would be how to support it, financially and technically, and without imposing on those who would be willing to devote resources to furthering this effort.

Commissioner Montgomery then asked Mr. Bill Phillips from the City of Phoenix ITS and Mr. Jesse Cooper as Phoenix Police Department's 800 MHz radio manager to begin their presentation on the Demonstration Project.

City of Phoenix Presentation: Mr. Phillips began his presentation by providing some additional background on the objectives for the project, and identified the opportunities that had been approved by the PSCC, their projected costs, and the infrastructure that has been put in place as follows:

- The 700 MHz radios were deployed for the Super Bowl, and as such, that objective had been partially carried out.
- The 700 MHz site at White Tanks and connectivity back to South Mountain/DPS was completed, in addition to adding the 700 MHz site on the Yuma system at Oatman.
- Motorola provided their prototype Inter RF Subsystem Interface (ISSI), which was installed at the DPS Encanto facility.
- The sites at White Tanks and Oatman were then added to the Yuma and Phoenix systems, and connected by digital microwave to support the ISSI link, and to provide an additional 90 miles of coverage where roaming could occur.

A kick off test was held on July 30th with participation by PSCC, DPS, YRCS, RWC and Motorola. Primary objectives were to exercise the gateway as much as possible, to test for audio quality, including the scenario called 'collide and divide', with a focus on the ISSI. From their vehicles, participants were to experience roaming from one system to another, across systems' boundaries, and to change talk groups or to remain in coverage and talk back to their dispatchers, as if they never left the area.

The following bullets summarize the outcomes from the Demonstration Project, as presented by Mr. Phillips, including feedback from participants, and with additional comment by Mr. Cooper:

- Roaming is possible when systems are properly configured, but is not automatic at this time.
- The timing issue associated with 'collide and divide' has yet to be worked out in this type of configuration.
- The ISSI worked well; it was a great product; people were impressed with the quality of the audio and surprised that the ISSI did not introduce any noticeable delays under stereo conditions.
- The product needs to have better mobility management; there is a lot of overhead associated with system administration and radio programming.
- When using the Push to Talk (PTT) feature, IDs/aliases do not come across the network at this time, impacting emergency operations.

- The Emergency button works (transmission occurs) but the radio ID does not display so it is impossible to find out who is in trouble.
- The product needs to be deployable in much easier fashion.
- The product is not something that should be implemented in close proximity areas but has a lot of applicability for operations and interoperability over wide areas.
- The product could be enhanced by having an interoperability system ID that would be recognized by both systems vs. having two different system IDs.
- There was agreement that this is not a substitute for a shared system.

In summary, Mr. Phillips advised the group that the Demonstration Project was considered to have merit, but other questions would need to be answered from a go-forward perspective, including such things as who would lead the project, and what to do about the ISSI prototype that needs to go back to Motorola. Also not addressed were SOPs and exercises to test the SOPs as well as how the ISSI performs in a real-world situation, and whether this was something that could be used as a system enhancement or a system of systems approach.

Mr. Cooper went on to clarify that the focus of this project was to help DPS and PSCC move forward with the decision regarding if/how to build out a State network statewide. Without a decision on approach from an operability perspective and a clearer mandate, he indicated there was not much more value to providing continued support, and if the decision is that the project is complete, then the equipment should be dismantled and those supporting it should move on.

Chairman Cummiskey and Ms. Meyerson both thanked Commissioner Montgomery and her team for putting the presentation together.

Facilitated Discussion

Dr. Hendry was asked to facilitate the discussion around the questions and decision points that the City of Phoenix presentation encapsulated.

Dr. Hendry began the facilitated portion of the discussion by asking for feedback from the group regarding the outcomes of the Demonstration Project, successes, lessons learned, and comments regarding how it would inform the long-term decision.

City of Phoenix Comments: Mr. Cooper stated that he viewed the project as a demonstration and a proof of concept regarding whether the ISSI was a viable solution, as PSCC decides between overbuilding and leveraging existing systems. Mr. Cooper also pointed out that the ISSI standards have not been completed at the Project 25 level, and no real users were put onto the system.

It was felt that the project could have evolved into a pilot if the next phase of putting radios into DPS vehicles had started. He indicated that while it was nice to have connectivity between

Phoenix and Yuma users, the intent was more to support the DPS function with this approach. It was anticipated that some of the issues that had been discovered could have been worked through, but a clear direction forward would be needed first.

In response to a question from Dr. Hendry, Mr. Cooper confirmed the concept proven by this project was to connect two Motorola systems. Dr. Hendry then asked DPS to address the group regarding how the project had been of benefit to them.

DPS/WSB Comments: Mr. Rogers first clarified that at the time the Demonstration Project was initiated, the PSCC was under DPS, but essentially worked for the Commission in developing this program. As the Wireless Systems Bureau Manager, he also had some questions regarding how the project would help DPS from an operability perspective, especially given the coverage area, while recognizing that interoperability was viable with radios alone.

Mr. Rogers advised that the DPS UHF component (which is used by DPS currently for operability) was also not part of the demonstration. Mr. Phillips confirmed that the configuration tested was only 700 MHz. Mr. Rogers then went on to explain that, even though the operability component would not satisfy DPS' needs, and that DPS was faced with budget and manpower challenges, his office did support the PSCC support office by providing space for test equipment and connectivity. He now needs that space back. He noted that while Yuma has taken back their equipment, the Phoenix equipment and the ISSI remains and may still function, but does not need to be housed in his office.

City of Phoenix Comments: In response to a question from Dr. Hendry regarding who currently owned the ISSI solution, Mr. Phillips responded that the ISSI still belonged to Motorola, that it was a beta product, and also proprietary. As such, it was capable of connecting only Motorola systems right now, although Motorola has given their commitment that it will be fully P25 compliant when that standard comes forward.

Mr. Phillips also confirmed for Dr. Hendry that should the decision be made to move forward with the ISSI-type solution, it would not be utilizing the equipment that is currently installed, but would need to wait for a future box to be available.

DPS/WSB Comments: Mr. Rogers agreed that the ISSI equipment was purely research-based at this time, and that from an operability perspective, DPS cannot run mission-critical traffic through this equipment, as it would be a violation of the ISSI contract.

In regard to comments made by Dr. Hendry regarding the prospect of putting 800 MHz radios into DPS vehicles, Mr. Rogers described the success that has been realized by putting the same band radios into officers' hands for pre-planned events such as the Super Bowl. From an interoperability perspective, he felt as though the same thing could be accomplished by putting the same technology into DPS vehicles and programming in the 16 talk groups that the City of

Phoenix established for cross-agency activity. The issues with that approach were again funding, and which cars would get the radios.

Dr. Hendry also pointed out the potential for 2-3 radios per car, which might not be a good operational solution, even if it were a technological solution. Mr. Rogers responded that he would like to see how it worked just to map the DPS UHF system to a City of Phoenix talk group on one radio.

City of Phoenix Comments: Mr. Cooper wanted to make it very clear that this was a PSCC-driven project and not a Yuma, Phoenix or DPS led project. While Phoenix was not advocating one course or the other, the three entities involved needed direction from the PSCC in regards to what would be done with the project. While he felt that participants would not be unhappy to free up the space and resources that were involved, the primary objective was to determine direction from PSCC in regard to the project.

Phoenix Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Mike Worrell stated that this technology provided dispatch with the ability to maintain communications with a unit during transit to a location, as well as interoperate with the agency coordinating a statewide response at that location, and in that respect, the demonstration was positive.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills responded that the ability to maintain communications during transit was an additional utility of the AIRS network as it exists today. After confirming with Mr. Cooper that the White Tanks site would probably continue to be used as part of a P6 type site initiative, and that Yuma would likely leave the Oatman site in place, Commissioner Wills summarized the benefits that had been realized from the project as: what had been learned about the ISSI, the enhancements to the RWC and YRCS, and another leg of digital microwave connectivity down to Yuma County that was put in place.

DPS/WSB Comments: In response to a question from Dr. Hendry regarding the benefits received for the monetary investment that was made in the project, Mr. Rogers first clarified a concern raised by La Paz County. He then confirmed that DPS would continue to benefit from the digital microwave link to Yuma, and that it was his understanding that the Phoenix and Yuma stations would remain in place, hopefully in a building that the Wireless Systems Bureau (WSB) at DPS manages, which would add to the interoperability component.

DPS Comments: While raising concerns regarding the sustainability of the approach without continued significant funding for a new State system, Executive Officer Felix responded that it would have been nice to have extended the demonstration to include programming and adding radios to more vehicles. But from his perspective, it was not critical to proving the concept, which can now be considered a potential technology to be used once planning and actual design and funding is available.

City of Phoenix Comments: In response to a question from Dr. Hendry in regard to whether any funding was left on the table, Mr. Cooper reiterated that the objectives of the project had been met, the concept proven, and that the assets that had been procured would continue to be used by those who could benefit from them. He also expressed agreement with Mr. Rogers that while this was not an operability solution for DPS, if it should become part of a larger solution in the future, it will be revisited. But right now, a conclusion was being sought for the project.

DPS/WSB Comments: SIEC Member Scott Tillman stated that, as an observer of the drive test, he felt the technology did provide interoperability and would be of use to a vehicle outside of its service area needing to maintain contact with its own dispatch or other units in the group it was working with. In that sense, the ISSI proved to be beneficial in showing real potential for interoperability, even though as currently configured, it would not support daily operational needs.

Mr. Rogers added that GITA-PSIC might want to ask Mr. Greg Wilkinson to update the Commission regarding current discussions that Yuma is having with Motorola regarding use of the ISSI to connect with Riverside County, although he went on to clarify that would be a separate project.

Chairman Comments: **After no additional comments were offered, Chairman Cummiskey summarized the discussion, noting that no formal action would be taken in this meeting.**

From his perspective, it sounded as though the project had value, did demonstrate additional capabilities, and also built out areas that previously did not have coverage. He had also heard that the technology itself is promising and that as future iterations materialize, there is value in looking at how what had been learned can be utilized in both operability and interoperability settings. He then asked the group to amend or edit his understanding of the principal players' belief in regard to the Demonstration Project - that it had concluded as a project and that the Commission itself should explore what next steps might be viable going forward.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills expressed support for the Chairman's statements, that the project had run its course, has potential advantage in the future and is complete.

No other comments were offered. Ms. Meyerson then reviewed additional administrative items, and as well as some of what would be addressed in the afternoon. Chairman Cummiskey addressed some additional comments to the Commissioners regarding the work that had been done and what lies ahead, to build upon the successes going forward.

*The session was adjourned for a lunch break with
a request to return for the afternoon session.*

3. Facilitated Discussion: The Future for Arizona

Ms. Meyerson called the meeting back to order at 1:35 PM. Roll call was again taken by Regina Bernal, and it was noted that some members were not able to stay for the afternoon session, including Chairman Cummiskey, who had asked that Ms. Meyerson express his regrets and gratitude for their participation and support. Ms. Meyerson asked that the record reflect PSCC and SIEC did not have a quorum in the morning or the afternoon. She then asked that Dr. Jennifer Hendry begin the discussion planned for the afternoon.

Dr. Hendry began the afternoon session with a discussion on basic operational definitions, including the terms 'operability' and 'interoperability', which had come up in the morning session. She presented a basic definition for each, stressing key words that might help to better define the difference between the two. Operability is the ability of a *single agency* to share information within its own agency via voice and data communications systems as part of "Daily Operations." Interoperability is the ability of public safety responders from *multiple agencie*s to share information via voice and data communications systems on demand, in real time, when needed, and as authorized.

Operability versus Interoperability

Sedona Fire District Comments: Commissioner Wills agreed that there were flaws in the proposed definitions that can impede moving forward, and pointed out some examples and ideas relative to regional systems. He agreed with SIEC Member Scott Tillman, in that interoperability is inherent in a regional system. He addressed Dr. Hendry's questions around what is/is not the purview of the PSCC, by discussing the many different variants of systems/agencies in place today. He provided an example of regional EMS providers that utilize two systems within their operation. He later gave an example where funding radios that meet the standards for the State provides interoperability along with operability, by one of the definitions. He questioned the process whereby funding is not allowed to be used to buy radios for operability, when that also prevents agencies from getting interoperability as well.

DPS/WSB Comments: SIEC Member Tillman stated he did not have an issue with the proposed definitions, and explained why he felt they were not dissimilar. He provided an example of ADOT, where a single agency is operating on more than one system today, indicating they were suffering from that in terms of their own internal interoperability.

AUDIENCE Comments: Attendees from the audience also offered suggestions in regard to interoperability being driven by the operations concept. Whenever agencies that normally don't operate in a particular area need to come together and multiple agencies are involved, then it's interoperability. But interoperability becomes operability if it goes on all of the time.

Phoenix Police Department Comments: Mr. Cooper cited an example of one of their biggest challenges in the metro area, which are the ad hoc task forces. Since not all of the radios

can/will work together, they need to choose a system to operate on from an operability perspective, but it was not clear if that is operability or interoperability.

Tucson Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Quinn stated his definition of an operable plan is when you're dealing with a single system, even if that is a task force adopting radios to be used on that system. An interoperable system is one where you have different systems patched together, that don't normally operate together.

AZ Dept of Transportation (ADOT) Comments: As part of later discussion, Mr. Bill Tait indicated that ADOT's view of operability is their own internal system. Interoperability was viewed as the ability to interact with other county, fire and state agencies they deal with on a regular basis. They would expect to accomplish that through the technological as well as operational solutions discussed that morning.

DPS Comments: As part of later discussion, Executive Officer Felix stated that he does think there is interoperability within a single agency. Each agency has acquired different equipment at different times, so they may only be able to operate within their own system today. The key to interoperability is 'as needed', and that isn't every day. But when talking about event driven activities, then the PSCC should look at how to enhance interoperability without dictating to any particular agency what their operability system is going to be. Rather, focus should be on setting standards, providing funding and helping to facilitate resources to move in a direction that will enhance interoperability down the road.

Achieving the Goal of Interoperability

AZDOHS Comments: In response to a request from Dr. Hendry that AZDOHS comment on the Fed's view of operability vs. interoperability, Ms. Lisa Hansen indicated that the grant guidelines are unclear. When AZDOHS looks to fund grants applications, they are looking for projects that lend themselves to interoperability. She supported the definition of interoperability that was being discussed, since it helped determine which agencies and what should be funded, in particular the regional systems.

In response to a request for clarification regarding the Governor's mandate, Ms. Hansen indicated that AZDOHS is trying to meet the current Secretary of Homeland Security and prior AZ Governor's mandate, which has been interpreted as 85% of the population should have interoperable communications by 2010. Since the Phoenix, Tucson and Flagstaff areas alone add up to about 85% percent of the State's population, the question had come up as to whether AIRS, once fully implemented and integrated, and with individuals trained to use it, might meet that goal.

DPS Comments: Executive Officer Felix stated that he would include every interoperable communications asset available, including AIRS, to meet that goal. Given that the Pima County system won't be operable within the next two years, there is no other way to meet that goal.

He agreed with Dr. Hendry's synopsis suggesting that by including AIRS, we should be able to say that in two years, we have provided the public safety responders serving those areas that represent 85% of the population of Arizona, with the technological capability of interoperating as one. While not every agency may be on board, due to limitations in funding, if the infrastructure is in place, then you've accomplished that goal.

Tucson Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Quinn said that without Pima County, the state could not reach its goal of 85%, given that PCWIN is still in the planning stages and is not targeted for rollout until 2011. He stressed that it was more important to put in place a system/program/project that meets the needs of the men and women in the field, than it is to meet a specific statistic.

While AIRS can be used to meet that goal, we need to recognize that it is limited to one channel, and many areas may not know what AIRS does. He felt that as soon as the State starts training users on AIRS, it will become obvious that it is inadequate to meet the needs of the State when everyone is trying to use it. He indicated that AIRS is actually an operable system that was set up to operate the way it does across the State. When AIRS is able to talk to all of the individual operable systems inside each municipality, then we have interoperable AIRS.

He later re-emphasized the importance of an oversight body that needs to specify what the minimum levels of training and compliance will be, and the need to concentrate on areas that don't have larger operable systems already.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills indicated that while there may be some loose pieces with AIRS in terms of training and such, it does provide a common platform and bridge for all agencies within Arizona to accomplish the 85% goal. But there are risks in making decisions only on that goal; there is a need to continue to enhance that ability to interoperate. Commissioner Wills later stated in response to Commissioner Quinn's comments, that while AIRS is doing exactly what it was designed to do, it was never intended to be the end point for interoperability   It is one tool that is available today, that along with other incident management resources, helps solve the interoperability issue. Commissioner Wills later added that there are many technical solutions other than AIRS to achieve interoperability today, including the microwave, cross-patching, etc. He felt that while the technology is assumed, the operational piece is a much bigger issue that we fail to focus on. He agreed that there was no agency with the mandate to standardize, provide, categorize, and certify training statewide. In response to questions regarding whether data interoperability was also part of this goal, Commissioner Wills indicated that when the commitment was made for the 85%, the Interoperability Continuum did not include data, only voice. Given what's left to be done in attaining goals in the area of voice alone, any heavy investment in data, which is not well-defined, is a long way off. He also pointed out that even though it was not part of the Interoperability Working Group discussions, data sharing was considered in the grant review process.

DPS/WSB Comments: In response to questions regarding data interoperability, SIEC Member Tillman reviewed some of the challenges in providing that type of interoperability, which are not likely to be addressed soon.

AZDOHS Comments: Ms. Hansen asked whether the Arizona Department of Emergency Management (ADEM), which has been tasked by the governor to provide training for the state, has the authority to mandate the training. Ms. Hansen later questioned whether the intent was to also include data in the definition of interoperability, since that would likely mean the goal could not be met. She indicated that clarity was needed around this definition, in order for AZDOHS to properly address funding for operability and data sharing.

AZ Criminal Justice Commission Comments: Mr. Bill Kalaf responded to comments regarding data interoperability by discussing some of the activities currently going on in the State in regard to data sharing. He indicated the question was whether those discussions rolled into these or not, and whether it would impact the grant process.

ADEM Comments: Mr. Goosley responded to the question about mandating training by referencing the SCIP, which states that ADEM would provide FEMA training to responders. However, they are not tasked with the upper level training and procedures not included in the FEMA coursework; ADEM does not go out to local level agencies to try and identify required training.

ADOT Comments: Mr. Tait concurred that ADEM does not mandate training. He suggested that could be addressed by establishing a board that develops the higher level training with buy-in from the counties and cities. This would provide the inter-agency involvement needed to establish protocols for interoperability. He also indicated his support for the 85% goal as a good one, but there was a need to recognize that 80% of ADOT's responses are outside of the 85% population area, which is the focus of their interoperability efforts.

Coconino County Sheriff's Office Comments: Mr. Tom Florman concurred that we needed to look beyond the 85% population goal, since there are many more non-residents in the State at any time that may be in all of the outlying areas.

System of Systems

Dr. Hendry then asked participants to consider some possible definitions for the term 'system of systems', after this subject came up in earlier discussions as well. She indicated there were several definitions of this term in the SCIP and other documents as well, and asked if participants could clarify what this means to them.

<u>Tucson Fire Department Comments</u>: In earlier discussion, Commissioner Quinn had stated the original proposal for PSCC to consider was for a statewide operable plan, which evolved into an interoperable plan, and then a system of systems.

<u>Sedona Fire Comments</u>: In earlier discussion, Commissioner Wills had suggested that the definition of a 'system' as the operable level, and a 'system of systems' as the interoperable, did not entirely capture the range of possibilities. He later provided examples of why that definition of 'system of systems' was not inclusive of every solution to solving the issue of people operating on different technologies, and why the Interoperability Continuum identifies other tools to achieve this goal. Commissioner Wills later went on to discuss the history around the use of the term 'system of systems' and what it came to mean over time. He indicated that the confusion wasn't around the term, but rather whether the State is one of those systems, or was instead a hybrid system, encompassing different systems within its structure. In response to concerns regarding the amount of money it would take to build out a statewide system, Commissioner Wills later indicated that there were strategies whereby the State of Arizona system could be built out incrementally, leveraging the Microwave system, sites and partnerships that are already in place.

<u>Phoenix Police Department Comments</u>: Mr. Cooper had indicated that some of the options available to address interoperability do not meet the needs of the intelligence community, where the higher level of security needed for what they are trying to accomplish complicates the issue.

<u>ADOT Comments</u>: Mr. Bill Tait had confirmed that ADOT does operate across two different frequency bands, so there was definitely interest in what a 'system of systems' was considered to be. He later indicated that ADOT would be happy with a 'system of systems' approach, as long as the State system was one of them.

<u>DPS/WSB Comments</u>: In response to a question regarding if there was a preference as to whether the State would be one of the systems in this design, Mr. Rogers discussed DPS' current operable system, and some of the history and concerns around the use of the term. He indicated that when referring to 'system of systems', he envisioned that someday the State will have a system to handle the growing needs for all State agencies. For interoperability, that system would have ties to other systems in different parts of the state, to address the 'system of systems' need for interoperability between agencies. In response to a question as to whether there was any intent that the State system be subordinate or equal to the other 5 systems being considered, Mr. Rogers indicated that would be open for discussion, but the hope was that they would be able to provide the type of communications that Commissioner Worrell had previously indicated were needed when Phoenix Fire left their regional system.

<u>Tucson Fire Department Comments</u>: Commissioner Quinn indicated that the advantage to having a statewide system, with the State providing the backbone that other systems plug into,

was that everyone is all operating the same way. He went on to point out that it's exceptionally expensive, however, and this would be the wrong time to be spending that kind of money.

Phoenix Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Worrell noted that in regard to comments made earlier by Mr. Rogers, the administrative aspects that go along with one definition of 'system of systems' are an issue in and of themselves. He thought that we could leverage the idea of having shared talk groups that could be accessed through a statewide system, and used like AIRS, as needed, to support special events.

Overlay

Dr. Hendry pointed out that there appeared to be a discrepancy in the definition of the term 'overlay'. She presented two examples and requested a dialogue on this subject, which included discussion of a State system, and the impacts of the current economy.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills stated that the second definition *'A separate, state owned and operated system that provides statewide coverage for all state agencies as well as other agencies that choose to subscribe to the system'* was better, in terms of the architecture that the State needs to have in place, as opposed to *'A state owned and operated system that provides coverage between regional systems'*. He later provided support to Mr. Tillman's argument regarding the importance of having redundancy to be able to protect systems, that despite all of their work, individual organizations cannot prevent from having failures. He felt that having that additional layer statewide, and then having regional systems that are redundant to the State, would provide extra protection that is important to all of us.

DPS Comments: Mr. Tillman addressed some of what he felt could be done to build a State system, without a huge investment in dollars, if we were able to leverage what was being put into place over time. He felt that a lot of the interoperability goals would be accomplished with systems that are already in place or by using funds like stimulus dollars to help build out the infrastructure that was needed, as long as we had a plan. He also spoke to previous discussions around some of the utilities having infrastructure that could be leveraged for this purpose, although there would be a need to ensure that public safety entities are protected in that scenario.

ADOT Comments: Mr. Tait indicated that he did not see any way out of having a State system to operate on, even if the funding issue won't go away. The ADOT system is coming to end of life, and there aren't enough systems for ADOT to become a subscriber on, to address all of their needs. He did not feel that the State should be a renter on any system, but should be the owner of a statewide system, that could provide an operational solution to the broad coverage they need as well as DPS. He later added that ADOT had done some cost analysis, and did not think that an upgrade to the ADOT system as a baseline for building on going forward was out of reach. It would take time and a consensus that this could be a viable P25 solution, which would allow interoperability for agencies in that area as well as with DPS. He suggested the plan

would be to start with an initial build out in the Phoenix metro, with a total build out of the system covering all of ADOT's operational areas over time.

Tucson Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Quinn supported Commissioner Wills' second definition and ADOT's comments, indicating that the State needed its own system to conduct agency business. If a local jurisdiction wants to plug into it and/or a large municipal area that already has its own system can interface with it, that would be ideal, but the first definition wouldn't work. He did inquire later in the discussion as to when PSCC had reached out to private companies to partner on these goals.

DPS/WSB Comments: SIEC Member Tillman indicated that part of the argument for its own State system is the need for a redundant overlay. The current State system provides some of that backup now. There may be an opportunity to enhance that by looking at larger high site wide-area coverage for those who might come along that need it. Mr. Rogers also clarified later in the discussion that Federal Engineering had previously reached out to utilities such as APS when gathering information for the Conceptual Design Report.

Mesa Fire Department Comments: Chief Gary Bradbury agreed that the State needs its own operable system to do State business. He relayed some of his experiences in regard to the system that Phoenix and Mesa were using. He felt that if the right decisions on the technology were made, it would create the same opportunities statewide that they had created in the metropolitan area, and the demand to come on the system would be overwhelming as well. He indicated that might also help to address some of the other issues discussed today, such as training, which would be that much easier since the same Project 25 system would be used every day. He acknowledged, however, that with current financial constraints, such a system was not likely to be in play.

APS Comments: Mr. Bailey suggested that the PSCC look at leveraging public/private partnerships as a way to meet these goals. He indicated that PSCC had reach out informally to APS in regard to its radio system, which is also getting towards the end of life, and indicated that APS would like to be a full partner in these efforts.

4. Next Steps

Governance

Ms. Meyerson began this portion of the meeting with an overview of the NGA Center for Best Practices Policy Academy grant award. She reviewed reference materials regarding the Academy, which is designed to help State governments establish / refine their interoperable governance structure. The work that will be undertaken would be completely in line with previous governance efforts, and plans are to start with the original Committee members, and make some adjustments, including bringing some additional resources on board as this moves

forward. The timeline of activities for the Academy was presented, which included the two out-of-state meetings that were planned. Ms. Meyerson indicated she would be looking for volunteers from the Commission and/or SIEC to act as representatives in those out-of-state meetings, along with GITA-PSIC staff, while the full committee would participate in all of the meetings held in the State. She also mentioned some of the other grant funding that would be used for Dr. Hendry to assist in drafting documents, etc. to support this process.

Tucson Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Quinn indicated that while the timeline was aggressive, he thought that it was doable in the nine months that had been established by the Academy. He indicated his support for proceeding with the program.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills stated that the governance discussion might be a little less complicated now than it might have been when last addressed, based on some of what had taken place.

DPS Comments: Executive Officer Felix stated that the work of the Governance Committee that he had previously chaired dovetails well into this, and should be used as a baseline to enter this process at the Academy. He indicated that one of the questions we continue to struggle with is what are we governing, and the Academy should help facilitate that discussion.

Mesa Fire Department Comments: Chief Bradbury suggested that as many members of the original Governance Committee as possible be retained, and felt that, with the work that's already been done, the nine-month time frame for the Academy was not unreasonable.

Upcoming Events

Ms. Meyerson then asked Dr. Hendry to discuss the SCIP Implementation Workshop that the Federal Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) had offered to facilitate in February. The OEC's goal was to have all of the statewide efforts align with where the feds wants to go. The NECP, National Emergency Communications Plan, is an open set of objectives that the OEC developed to try and to achieve that goal. Ms Meyerson advised that the intent was also to have the SCIP Implementation Workshop be conducted in a working session format that would put some of what had been discussed today into action items.

Ms. Meyerson then reviewed an additional federal activity planned in December that is designed to bring folks together at a multi-state level. She advised that the Technical Assistance (TA) requests are in process and moving forward.

Outreach

Ms. Meyerson then asked that participants provide GITA-PSIC with some additional guidance regarding how to do a better job of outreach to the smaller players throughout the State that we want to hear from and involve in these interactions. She emphasized the importance of

outreach to achieving the goals of the PSCC and indicated that GITA-PSIC Outreach Manager Michael Todd would work to take the message of the PSCC to constituents around the State.

ADOT Comments: Mr. Tait indicated it was essential that GITA-PSIC hold meetings in other areas of the State, as planned.

Pinal County Comments: Mr. Vargo suggested a formal outreach to the counties, including the existing consortium for communications in Pinal County, to encourage them to engage in assisting or advising the PSCC. Some education or communication may be necessary around how these efforts tie into Homeland Security grant funding and the RAC structure, as well as who their representatives were on the Commission. Mr. Vargo later questioned whether the intent was to have representation from across the State on the PSCC that would be responsible for addressing issues in each representative's own area.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills suggested that outreach activity should include the Police Chief, Fire Chief and Sheriff's Association, Fire Districts, EMS and highway users, if an association represented that group. He also suggested contacting the county emergency managers, as well as the possibility of a subcommittee or other formal structure where key players and Ops center managers, that are fundamental to this process, can engage in open forum conversation around their concerns.

DPS/WSB Comments: SIEC Member Tillman indicated that the next MAG PSAP Managers Group Meeting was scheduled in January, and he could assist in getting this on the agenda. He also suggested attending the Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) and the National Emergency Managers Association (NEMA) meetings.

Tucson Fire Department Comments: Commissioner Quinn responded to Dr. Hendry's questions regarding the issue of travel costs, and the possibility of electronic formats given the Open Meeting laws. He indicated that members had joined the meetings telephonically in the past, although he was not sure if a 'Go to Meeting' had ever been looked into; he felt there would still need to be a central forum for the public to arrive at, to be able to participate or at least overhear the proceedings. He suggested that the PSCC could request that someone from GITA-PSIC attend the PSAP meetings to represent PSCC interests and report back. He later went on to emphasize in response to Mr. Vargo's question regarding representation, that members were not picked by the Governor to represent a region or an occupation per se, and that any issue can be brought to any member of the Commission to address.

Grant Funding Timeline

Ms. Hansen announced that in addition to the IECGP grant funding previously referred to, the FFY09 grant funding (all 14 funding streams from federal DHS) had also dropped down three months earlier this year. She provided a schedule of presentations for various stakeholders throughout Arizona, and some high-level information on changes to the process that would be

discussed in the meetings. She addressed questions regarding the match requirement, indicating there was no match, but there were bonus points instead. She also indicated that the State received just slightly less than last year, and that AZDOHS would be submitting a much more specific grant application this year, similar to how the $17.7 million PSIC grant was handled. She provided some additional information in response to Dr. Hendry's question regarding the differences between the PSIC grant and the IECGP grant where governance and training were priorities. She did not foresee that Arizona would meet the requirement for equipment as the third priority for IECGP funding, which would also require a match. In the context of the Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), she advised that there will be the categories under which operability and interoperability equipment can be funded, with the same guidance as had been used in previous years for equipment, which allowed for P-25 capable radios.

Sedona Fire Comments: Commissioner Wills inquired as to whether there was a match requirement on these funds, and if there was any indication of funding levels. He also asked Ms. Hansen to confirm that VHF radios, as well as those primarily for operability, could be funded with the grant money, given that there would not be an opportunity for the Commission to meet in order to resolve some of these issues prior to grant application submission. He also suggested there might be something that as a group could be coordinated to take best advantage of the IECPG grant monies specifically targeted for governance and training.

After acknowledging GITA-PSIC support staff and all those who had participated in the discussion today, Ms. Meyerson referred participants to the web site for additional materials that would be posted and closed the meeting.

The session was adjourned.